

REMARKS

The Examiner indicated the following in the Office Action mailed on February 25, 2009, for the currently pending application.

The Examiner's Action to the Previously Submitted Amendment Response

In previously submitted response, the Applicant respectfully has requested the Examiner to revisit these issues when the claims of this application and co-pending Application No. 11,006,356 are finalized. The Examiner has accepted the above in the pending Office Action.

The Examiner has withdrawn the rejections of claims 19, 23 and 27 under 35 U.S.C §112, Second Paragraph as the Applicant has submitted in the previously submitted response.

The Examiner has withdrawn the rejections of claims 31 through 39 under 35 U.S.C §101 should be withdrawn as the Applicant has submitted in the previously submitted response.

Although the Examiner rejected claims 10-12, 14, 19, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vilhuber et al. US 7,386,721, the current Office Action is silent on these section 102 rejections. However, since the pending Office Action does not provide any basis for the 102 rejections, the Applicant assumes that the Examiner has withdrawn the previous section 102 rejections in response to the previously submitted response.

The Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner alleges that claims 10 through 22 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vilhuber and Amro et al. The Examiner also alleges that claims 1 through 9 and 23 through 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vilhuber and Amro et al in view of Ramasubramani et al.

Newly amended independent claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31, 32 and 36 each explicitly recite “daily production units.” Furthermore, newly amended independent claims 1, 2, 6, 31, 32 and 36 also explicitly recite “storing digital certificates only for each of the daily production units. Similarly, newly amended independent claims 10, 11 and 15 also explicitly recite “receiving a corresponding one of the digital certificates for the predetermined number of daily production units from the digital certificate management device.” Lastly, newly amended independent claims 19, 23 and 27 also explicitly recite “said digital certificate transmission unit receiving the corresponding one of the digital certificates for the predetermined number of daily production units from said second digital certificate transmission unit.” In other words, the newly amended independent claims each require that the “digital certificates” are generated only for the “daily production units.”

The Vilhuber reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest the above discussed patentable features of the independent claims. In general, the Vilhuber reference discloses a digital certificate that is associated with certain information such as a predetermined public key. Although the Vilhuber reference discloses an internal certificate authority (CA) in a preferred embodiment, the certificates must be ultimately registered and certified at an external certificate authority via secure communication. Even though the Vilhuber reference discloses a digital certificate that may be associated

with a predetermined public key, the Vilhuber reference still fails to disclose, teach or suggest the uniquely required “digital certificates” for the “daily production units.”

The Amro et al. reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest the above discussed patentable features of the independent claims. In general, the Amro et al. reference discloses a software installing system for a built-to-order computer system so that an appropriate set of software is installed on a custom built computer. The Amro et al. reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest “digital certificates,” let alone the uniquely required “digital certificates” for the “daily production units.”

The Ramasubramani et al. reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest the above discussed patentable features of the independent claims. In general, the Ramasubramani et al. reference discloses a centralized certificate management system for two-way interactive communication devices in data networks. The Ramasubramani et al. reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest the generation of “digital certificates,” let alone the uniquely required “digital certificates” for the “daily production units.”

In view of the disclosures in the cited references, even if they are combined as alleged, the combined disclosures still fail to disclose, teach or suggest “digital certificates” that are generated only for the “daily production units.” Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the patentable features as explicitly recited the newly amended independent claims based upon the cited references alone or in combination.

Dependent claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34 and 35 ultimately depend from one of independent claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31, 32 and 36 and incorporate the above discussed patentable

DOCKET NO.: RCOH-1070

PATENT

Application No.: 10/815,043

Response to Final Rejection Office dated February 25, 2009

Amendment dated April 20, 2009

Page -24-

features. Therefore, based upon the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 1 through 39 under Section 103 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request a favorable Office Action so indicating.

Respectfully submitted,

/KEN I. YOSHIDA/

Date: April 20, 2009

Ken I. Yoshida, Esq.

Reg. No. 37,009

KNOBLE YOSHIDA & DUNLEAVY LLC

Customer No. 21302

Eight Penn Center, Suite 1350

1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd.

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Telephone: (215) 599-0600

Facsimile: (215) 599-0601